

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **April 20, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-34. There is insufficient antecedent basis for “the connector” in claim 25. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Jones (USPN 5,684,984, hereinafter “Jones”). Claims 6 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones.

Objections to the Claims

There is insufficient antecedent basis for “the connector” in claim 25.

Applicant has amended claim 25 to read “a connector” in place of “the connector.”

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 were rejected as being anticipated by Jones. Applicant respectfully points out that Jones teaches distributing change information **at a set time** or on demand to only those entities that have **expressed interest** in the changes (see Jones, col. 4, lines 7-14 and col. 2, lines 15-17).

In contrast, the present invention **automatically distributes changes** immediately after the object has been changed **without associated systems having to register** or express interest in the changes (see page 2, lines 7-16 of the instant application). Automatically distributing changes immediately after the object has been changed without associated systems having to register or express interest in the changes is beneficial because it ensures that all copies of the object are synchronized.

In the system of Jones, if an object fails to express interest in (register for) changes to the object, the object can quickly be outdated. There is nothing within Jones, either explicit or implicit, which suggests automatically distributing

changes immediately after the object has been changed without associated systems having to register or express interest in the changes.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 to clarify that the present invention automatically distributes changes immediately after the object has been changed without associated systems having to register or express interest in the changes. These amendments find support on page 2, lines 7-16 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12, 21, 28, and 32-34 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-11, which depend upon claim 1, claims 13-20, which depend upon claim 12, claims 22-27, which depend upon claim 21, and claims 9-31, which depend upon claim 28, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By



Edward J. Grundler

Registration No. 47, 615

Date: April 28, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665